The third virial coefficient of a two-component unitary Fermi gas across an Efimov-effect threshold

Chao Gao*, Shimpei Endo and Yvan Castin

*Institute for Advanced Study, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China
Laboratoire Kastler Brossel, ENS-PSL, CNRS, UPMC-Sorbonne Universités, Collège de France, Paris, France

arXiv:1412.1974v3 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 28 May 2015

PACS 67.85.d – Ultracold gases, trapped gases.

Abstract –We consider a mixture of two single-spin-state fermions with an interaction of negligible range and infinite s-wave scattering length. By varying the mass ratio α across $\alpha_c \simeq 13.6069$ one can switch on-and-off the Efimov effect. We determine analytically the third cluster coefficient of the gas. We show that it is a smooth function of α across α_c since, unexpectedly, the three-body parameter characterizing the interaction is relevant even on the non-Efimovian side $\alpha < \alpha_c$.

Introduction. – A powerful theory tool in the statistical physics of interacting quantum systems is the so-called cluster or virial expansion, where the thermodynamic potentials are expanded in powers of the small degeneracy parameter [1]. Whereas the second cluster coefficient b_2 had a known general expression since the 1930s [2], it has been a long-lasting challenge to determine the third cluster coefficient b_3 explicitly. Starting from the late 1950s, analytical results for b_3 have been obtained for the two-body hard-core model, the archetype of non-resonant interactions where the s-wave scattering length a is at most of the order of the interaction range, in the form of expansions in powers of a small parameter λ/a [3] or a/λ [4], where λ is the thermal de Broglie wavelength.

Interest in b_3 was reactivated by recent experimental breakthrough with cold atoms: long-lived spin 1/2 Fermi gases can be prepared in the resonantly interacting regime ($|a| \gg$ interaction range) via Feshbach resonances [5]. This motivated numerical calculation of b_3 in maximally interacting, unitary limit $1/a = 0$, with the harmonic regulator technique of [6] as done in [7], or with diagrams [8]. Due to scaling invariance in the unitary limit, b_3 is just a number, and via a precise measurement of the gas equation of state [9, 10], its predicted value was confirmed [10].

Physics is richer when the Efimov effect [11] sets in: the continuous scaling invariance is broken, there appears a length scale R_t characterizing the interaction, the three-body parameter, and there exists an infinite number of trimer states with an asymptotically geometric spectrum. The third cluster coefficient b_3 becomes a function of temperature. In a spinless bosonic gas with zero-range interactions, it was determined analytically [12]. Within the three-body hard-core model that fixes R_t [13], Quantum Monte Carlo simulations have confirmed this analytical prediction and have shown that the third order cluster expansion can provide a good description of the gas down to the liquid-gas transition [14], exemplifying its usefulness.

The problem is even more intriguing when a system parameter allows to switch on-and-off the Efimov effect, as in the two-component Fermi gas with adjustable mass ratio. For two identical fermions and a distinguishable particle, there is an Efimov effect if the fermion-other particle mass ratio α exceeds $\alpha_c = 13.6069\ldots$ [11, 15]. Up to now, the calculation of b_3 is numerical and limited to $\alpha < \alpha_c$ [16]. Strikingly it predicts that b_3 has an infinite derivative at $\alpha = \alpha_c$. As b_3 is a coefficient in the grand potential Ω, this would imply a singular derivative of Ω as a function of α, i.e. a first order phase transition, subsisting at arbitrarily low phase space density, i.e. at temperatures T arbitrarily higher than the Fermi temperature T_F, contrarily to common expectations for phase transitions. The present work determines b_3 analytically and solves this paradox.

The cluster expansion. – We consider a mixture of two fully polarized fermionic species, with single particle masses m_1 and m_2, with no intraspecies interaction and a purely s-wave interspecies interaction, of negligible range and infinite scattering length (unitary limit). At thermal equilibrium in a cubic box, the total pressure P admits in the thermodynamic limit the cluster expansion

$$\frac{P\lambda_r^3}{k_B T} = \sum_{(n_1,n_2)\in\mathbb{N}^2} b_{n_1,n_2} z_1^{n_1} z_2^{n_2} \qquad (1)$$

where z_i are fugacities $\exp(\beta\mu_i)$, $\lambda_r = [2\pi\hbar^2/(m_r k_B T)]^{1/2}$ is the thermal de Broglie wavelength associated to the reduced mass $m_r = m_1 m_2/(m_1+m_2)$ and temperature T, $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$, μ_i is the chemical potential of species i, and $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of all non-negative integers.

To determine the cluster coefficients b_{n_1,n_2} one can use the harmonic regulator trick [6]: one rather assumes that the system is at thermal equilibrium in an isotropic harmonic trap, with the same trap frequency ω for the two species, and one considers the cluster expansion of $(-\Omega)/(k_B T Z_1)$ in powers of z_1 and z_2, with Ω the grand potential and Z_1 the single particle partition function in the trap. When $\omega \to 0$, the corresponding coefficients have a limit B_{n_1,n_2} that one can relate to b_{n_1,n_2} [6,7,16]:

$$B_{n_1,n_2} = \left(\frac{m_r}{n_1 m_1 + n_2 m_2}\right)^{3/2} b_{n_1,n_2} \tag{2}$$

We study $B_{2,1}$ as a function of the mass ratio $\alpha = m_1/m_2$.

Case $\alpha < \alpha_c$: 0-parameter zero-range model. – The cluster coefficient $B_{2,1}$ can be deduced from the partition functions of up to three bodies in the trap, that is from the n-body energy spectra for $n \leq 3$. In the unitary limit, the interspecies interaction is described by the Bethe-Peierls binary contact condition on the wavefunction, which leads to a separable three-body Schrödinger equation in internal hyperspherical coordinates [11] even in a harmonic trap [17–19]. The hyperangular part of the problem can be solved in position space [11] or in momentum space [20]: the corresponding real eigenvalue s^2 (that will serve as a separability constant) obeys the transcendental equation $\Lambda_l(s) = 0$ of explicit expression [21][1]

$$\Lambda_l(s) = \cos\nu + \frac{1}{\sin\nu}\int_{\frac{\pi}{2}-\nu}^{\frac{\pi}{2}+\nu} \mathrm{d}\theta\, P_l\left(\frac{\cos\theta}{\sin\nu}\right)\frac{\sin(s\theta)}{\sin(s\pi)} \tag{3}$$

with $l \in \mathbb{N}$ the angular momentum, P_l a Legendre polynomial, $\nu = \arcsin\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ the mass angle. We call $(u_{l,n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ the positive roots of Λ_l, sorted in increasing order. There is no complex root for $\alpha < \alpha_c$. The hyperradial part of the wavefunction, after multiplication by R^2, solves an effectively bidimensional Schrödinger equation:

$$EF = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}\left(F'' + \frac{1}{R}F'\right) + \left(\frac{\hbar^2 s^2}{2MR^2} + \frac{1}{2}M\omega^2 R^2\right)F \tag{4}$$

where s is any of the $u_{l,n}$, $M = 2m_1 + m_2$ is the mass of two particles of species 1 and one particle of species 2, and the hyperradius R is the corresponding mass-weighted root-mean-square deviation of the positions of the three particles from their center of mass. Solving Eq.(4) with the usual boundary conditions that $F(R)$ vanishes at zero and infinity gives

$$E = (s+1+2q)\hbar\omega, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N} \tag{5}$$

The semi-infinite ladder structure of this spectrum, with equidistance $2\hbar\omega$, reflects the existence of an undamped breathing mode of the trapped non-Efimovian unitary gas [23] related to its $SO(2,1)$ dynamical symmetry [24].

Finally $B_{2,1}$ is the $\omega \to 0$ limit of a series [7,12][2]:

$$B_{2,1} = \lim_{\omega\to 0} \sum_{(l,n,q)\in\mathbb{N}^3} (2l+1)\left[e^{-(u_{l,n}+1+2q)\beta\hbar\omega} - e^{-(v_{l,n}+1+2q)\beta\hbar\omega}\right] \tag{6}$$

with $v_{l,n} = l + 2n + 1$ the positive poles of $\Lambda_l(s)$ [21]. The summation over q can be done, and even over n by inverse application of the residue theorem [12]:

$$B_{2,1} = -\sum_{l\in\mathbb{N}}\left(l+\frac{1}{2}\right)\int_0^{+\infty}\frac{\mathrm{d}S}{\pi}\ln\frac{\Lambda_l(iS)}{\cos\nu} \tag{7}$$

As shown in Fig. 1, the result agrees with the numerical evaluation of the series by [16]. The analytics however directly allows to see why $B_{2,1}$ has an infinite derivative with respect to α at $\alpha = \alpha_c^-$: it suffices to isolate the contribution of the channel $(l,n) = (1,0)$ in Eq.(6), the only one where $u_{l,n}$ vanishes at $\alpha = \alpha_c$, by the splitting

$$B_{2,1} = B_{2,1}^{(1,0)} + B_{2,1}^{\neq(1,0)} \tag{8}$$

All the other channels have $u_{l,n} > 1$ over the figure range and give a smooth contribution to $B_{2,1}$. On the contrary

$$\begin{aligned} B_{2,1}^{(1,0)} &= \lim_{\omega\to 0} 3\sum_{q\in\mathbb{N}}\left[e^{-(u_{1,0}+1+2q)\beta\hbar\omega} - e^{-(v_{1,0}+1+2q)\beta\hbar\omega}\right] \\ &= -\frac{3}{2}(u_{1,0} - v_{1,0}) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

and $u_{1,0}$, a decreasing function of α, vanishes as $(\alpha_c - \alpha)^{1/2}$ since $\Lambda_1(s)$ is even, so that $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}B_{2,1}$ diverges as $(\alpha_c-\alpha)^{-1/2}$.

Case $\alpha > \alpha_c$: Efimov zero-range model. – We now assume that the mass ratio obeys $\alpha_c < \alpha < 75.99449\ldots$ [25], so that the Efimov effect takes place in the sector $l = 1$ only. The function $\Lambda_{l=1}$ has a pair of complex conjugate purely imaginary roots $\pm s$ and we set

$$u_{1,0} = s = i|s| \tag{10}$$

$|s|$ vanishes as $(\alpha - \alpha_c)^{1/2}$ and increases with α. The $1/R^2$ potential in Schrödinger's equation (4) for $F(R)$ becomes attractive, which leads to a "fall to the center" [26] and to an unphysical continuous spectrum of bound states, forcing to modify the boundary condition at $R = 0$ [27]:

$$F(R) \underset{R\to 0}{=} (R/R_t)^{i|s|} - (R/R_t)^{-i|s|} + O(R^2) \tag{11}$$

[1] There exists a less explicit hypergeometric expression for Λ_l [22].

[2] Actually one calculates the difference between partition functions of unitary and non-interacting problems; still this directly gives $B_{2,1}$ of the unitary gas since $B_{2,1}$ is zero for the ideal gases; the contributions of the Laughlinian states (whose wavefunction vanishes when two particles are at the same point) cancel out in the difference; the $v_{l,n}$ appear via the non-Laughlinian spectrum of the non-interacting three-body problem. Similarly, the contributions of the unphysical root $s = 2$ in the sector $l = 0$, which exists in both the unitary and non-interacting cases, automatically cancel out.



Fig. 1: Reduced third cluster coefficient $e^{\beta E_0}\bar{B}_{2,1}$ of a trapped two-component three-dimensional unitary Fermi gas in the zero trapping frequency limit, as a function of the mass ratio $\alpha = m_1/m_2$ of the two species (lower x-axis) or of the root $s = u_{1,0}$ of Λ_1 (upper x-axis), for various values of the three-body parameter R_t, and hence of the global energy scale $E_{\rm glob}$ of Eqs.(13,24). Here E_0 is the ground free-space three-body energy, a smooth function of α: for $\alpha \leq \alpha_c$, $E_0 = 0$; for $\alpha > \alpha_c$, $E_0 = -E_{\rm glob}\exp(-2\pi/|s|)$ is the ground trimer energy and the factor $\exp(\beta E_0)$ ensures that the plotted quantity remains bounded. Curves from bottom to top for $\alpha \lesssim 15$: $\beta E_{\rm glob} = 10^2$(cyan), 3×10^2(red), 10^3(green), 3×10^3(blue), 10^4(violet), 10^5(orange), 10^6(magenta). The curves cross, which shows that $e^{\beta E_0}\bar{B}_{2,1}$ is not, at all fixed α, an increasing function of $\beta E_{\rm glob}$ (see inset in Fig. 2). Discontinuous black solid line: limit $\beta E_{\rm glob} \to +\infty$, corresponding for $\alpha \leq \alpha_c$ to the genuine 0-parameter zero-range model studied numerically in [16] (black circles), and being, for $\alpha > \alpha_c$, identically equal to 3, the ground-trimer contribution. Vertical dotted line: critical mass ratio α_c where the Efimov effect sets in.

To make evident that the third cluster coefficient now depends on *one* parameter, this length R_t called three-body parameter, we write it as $\bar{B}_{2,1}$, that is with *one* overlining bar. In free space, Eq.(11) leads to a discrete infinite number of Efimov trimer states, with a purely geometric spectrum extending from $-\infty$ to 0. In any physical system, however, the interaction is not strictly zero range and the spectrum must be bounded from below [11]. One may expect that finite range effects then spoil the geometric nature of the spectrum for the more deeply bound trimers. However, for a narrow Feshbach resonance [21, 28], for momentum-space cut-off models of a Feshbach resonance [29, 30], and for the three-body hard core model [13], the spectrum is almost entirely geometric, at least when $|s|$ is not too large ($|s| \lesssim 1$), and becomes entirely geometric when $\alpha \to \alpha_c^+$, since the typical particle wavenumber times the interaction range tends to zero [21]. In what follows, we assume the bounded from below geometric free space spectrum:

$$\epsilon_q(0^+) \equiv \lim_{\omega\to 0}\epsilon_q(\omega) = -E_{\rm glob}e^{-2\pi(1+q)/|s|}, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N} \quad (12)$$

The global energy scale $E_{\rm glob}$ can be calculated from a microscopic model for the interaction, as it was done in the above mentioned models. Here we take it as a parameter that solution of Eq.(4) with $\omega = 0$ and with the boundary condition (11) relates to R_t as

$$E_{\rm glob} = \frac{2\hbar^2}{MR_t^2}e^{[\ln\Gamma(1+s)-\ln\Gamma(1-s)]/s} \quad (13)$$

with $\ln\Gamma$ the usual branch of the Γ function logarithm.

The contribution to $\bar{B}_{2,1}$ of the channels $(l,n) \neq (1,0)$ is unchanged since no Efimov effect occurs in these channels:

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{\neq(1,0)} = B_{2,1}^{\neq(1,0)} \quad (14)$$

We calculate it as in [12], using Eq.(7) as it is for $l \neq 1$, while substituting $\Lambda_l(iS)$ with $\frac{S^2+v_{1,0}^2}{S^2+u_{1,0}^2}\Lambda_l(iS)$ for $l = 1$. In the Efimovian channel $(l,n) = (1,0)$, the spectrum is no longer given by Eq.(5), but by the solution of the transcendental equation deduced from [31] and rewritten as in [12, 32] to match Eq.(12) in free space:

$$\mathrm{Im}\ln\Gamma\Big(\frac{1+s-\epsilon_q/(\hbar\omega)}{2}\Big) + \frac{|s|}{2}\ln\Big(\frac{2\hbar\omega}{E_{\rm glob}}\Big) + (q+1)\pi = 0 \quad (15)$$

so that the first identity in Eq.(9) is replaced by

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)} = \lim_{\omega\to 0} 3\sum_{q\in\mathbb{N}}\Big[e^{-\beta\epsilon_q(\omega)} - e^{-(v_{1,0}+1+2q)\beta\hbar\omega}\Big] \quad (16)$$

For a small enough non-zero ω, two classes emerge in the three-body spectrum: (i) negative eigenenergies, that are the equivalent of free space trimer energies, and (ii) positive eigenenergies, that are the equivalent of the free space continuum. The second class is a harmonic spectrum except for an energy dependent "quantum defect" $\Delta(\epsilon)$ [32]

$$\frac{\epsilon_q(\omega)}{\hbar\omega} \underset{q\to+\infty}{=} 2q + \Delta(\epsilon_q(\omega)) + O(1/q) \quad (17)$$

where $q\omega$ is $\approx$ fixed. By the reasoning of [12], we get

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)} = 3\sum_{q\in\mathbb{N}}[e^{-\beta\epsilon_q(0^+)} - 1] - \frac{3}{2}\int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{d}\epsilon\beta[\Delta(\epsilon) - (1+v_{1,0})]e^{-\beta\epsilon} \quad (18)$$

We obtained a new expression of the quantum defect[3]:

$$\Delta(\epsilon) = 2 + \frac{2}{\pi}\,\mathrm{atan}\,\frac{\tan(\frac{|s|}{2}x)}{\mathrm{th}(\frac{|s|}{2}\pi)} + 2\left\lfloor\frac{|s|x}{2\pi}\right\rceil \quad (19)$$

where $x = \ln(\epsilon/E_{\rm glob})$. The nearest-integer function in the last term exactly compensates the jumps of the atan function when $\tan(|s|x/2)$ diverges, so as to render $\Delta(\epsilon)$ a smooth function of ϵ and of $|s|$.

[3] This expression and the one (C6) of [32] are equal, since their difference is a continuous function of x that vanishes at zero and has an identically zero derivative.

The corresponding values of $\bar{B}_{2,1}$ for $\alpha > \alpha_c$ are shown in Fig.1, after multiplication by a factor $e^{\beta E_0}$, where $E_0 = \epsilon_{q=0}(0^+)$ is the ground trimer energy, so as to absorb its contribution that becomes rapidly dominant and divergent for $k_B T < |E_0|$ [33]. The result depends on $\beta E_{\rm glob}$, a parameter that must be $\gg 1$: our theory, being zero range, requires that R_t, of order of the interaction range or effective range, as in the three-body hard core and narrow Feshbach resonance models respectively, is $\ll$ the thermal de Broglie wavelength $\lambda_t = [2\pi\hbar^2/(M k_B T)]^{1/2}$. Clearly, there is a discrepancy of $B_{2,1}(\alpha)$ and $\bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha)$ at $\alpha_c^{\mp}$ at non-zero R_t. When $R_t \to 0$ ($E_{\rm glob} \to +\infty$) there is agreement at α_c, as seen by first taking the $s \to 0$ limit in Eq.(19),

$$\Delta(\epsilon) \underset{\alpha\to\alpha_c^+}{\to} \Delta_0(\epsilon) = 2 + \frac{2}{\pi}\,\mathrm{atan}\,\frac{\ln(\epsilon/E_{\rm glob})}{\pi} \tag{20}$$

then taking the $R_t \to 0$ limit in Eq.(18)[4]:

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}(\alpha_c^+) = -\frac{3}{2}\int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{d}\epsilon\beta[\Delta_0(\epsilon) - (1+v_{1,0})]e^{-\beta\epsilon}$$
$$\underset{\beta E_{\rm glob}\to+\infty}{=} \frac{3}{2}v_{1,0} - \frac{3}{\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})} + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})}\right)^2 \tag{21}$$

successfully collated with the $u_{1,0} \to 0$ value of Eq.(9). The key point however is that this $R_t \to 0$ limit is in practice inaccessible, due to the very slow logarithmic convergence. We expect this problem to extend to $\alpha < \alpha_c$, which makes the strictly zero-range calculation of [16] not fully realistic. There also remains the puzzle of the diverging derivative of $B_{2,1}(\alpha)$ with respect to α at α_c^-. Both issues are solved in the next section.

Case $\alpha < \alpha_c$ revised: 1-parameter zero-range model. – We now see that a three-body parameter R_t must be introduced for $\alpha < \alpha_c$, i.e. even in the absence of Efimov effect, when α is close enough to α_c. The root $s = u_{1,0} > 0$ then vanishes as $(\alpha_c - \alpha)^{1/2}$ and the centrifugal barrier in the hyperradial equation (4) weakens, so that the function $F(R)$, the eigenenergies E and the third cluster coefficient become increasingly sensitive to short distance physics of the interaction [30, 34].

Assume that three-body physics inside the interaction range is described by an extra term $V(R)F$ compared to Eq.(4), e.g. a three-body hard core of radius b. Knowing that the relevant eigenenergies E are at most a few $k_B T$, and that $b \ll \lambda_t$, we can make the following reasonings.

(i) at $R \ll \lambda_t$, one can obtain the behavior of $F(R)$ by a zero-energy calculation (neglecting the EF term) in free space (since the harmonic oscillator length is $\gg \lambda_t$). Due to $b \ll \lambda_t$ there exists a range $b \ll R \ll \lambda_t$ where one can also neglect $V(R)$. Then $F(R)$ is a superposition of the two particular solutions R^s and R^{-s}, with relative amplitudes fixed by a length R_t that depends on microscopic details of $V(R)$, e.g. $R_t = b$ for the three-body hard core[5]:

$$F(R) \underset{b\ll R\ll\lambda_t}{\simeq} (R/R_t)^s - (R/R_t)^{-s} \tag{22}$$

(ii) one can approach the same range $b \ll R \ll \lambda_t$ from large distances. The trapping potential and the EF term must now be kept, and $F(R)$ is the unique solution (up to normalisation) of Eq.(4) that does not diverge at infinity, a Whittaker function of R^2 divided by R [19]. Then at $R \ll \lambda_t$, $F(R)$ is also found to be a linear superposition of R^s and R^{-s}, as it must be, but with coefficients $A_{\pm}(E)$ that are known functions of E. Matching with Eq.(22) gives an implicit equation for E, as if Eq.(4) was subjected to the modified boundary condition at $R = 0$ [18, 35][6]:

$$F(R) \underset{R\to 0}{=} (R/R_t)^s - (R/R_t)^{-s} + O(R^{2-s}) \tag{23}$$

The third term in Eq.(23), coming from a property of the Whittaker function, is negligible as compared to the first one, and this model makes sense, for $s < 1$ i.e. $\alpha > 8.6185\ldots$. Remarkably this reproduces the Efimov zero-range model (11) if one formally replaces s by $i|s|$. Then it is natural to extend the definition of $E_{\rm glob}$ to $\alpha < \alpha_c$ [7]:

$$E_{\rm glob} \underset{0<s<1}{=} \left(\frac{\Gamma(1+s)}{\Gamma(1-s)}\right)^{1/s} \frac{2\hbar^2}{M R_t^2} \tag{24}$$

where the first factor is a smooth function of α, as its series expansion involves only even powers of s.

The more common boundary condition $F(R = 0) = 0$, that led to the spectrum (5), is usually justified as follows: at $R \approx \lambda_t$, the R^{-s} term in (22) is negligible as compared to the R^s term in the zero-range limit $b \ll \lambda_t$, that is $\beta E_{\rm glob} \gg 1$ as one expects $R_t \approx b$ [8]:

$$\frac{(\lambda_t/R_t)^{-s}}{(\lambda_t/R_t)^s} \approx (\beta E_{\rm glob})^{-s} \ll 1 \tag{25}$$

However this condition becomes more and more difficult to satisfy when $\alpha \to \alpha_c^-$, and it will be violated when

$$s \lesssim \frac{1}{\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})} \tag{26}$$

This forces us to recalculate the third cluster coefficient with the boundary condition (23). From the implicit equa-

[4] One takes $\beta\epsilon$ as integration variable and one expands the integrand in powers of $1/\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$.

[5] If one sets $F(R) = R^{-s}\phi(r = R^{2s})$ then $F'' + F'/R - s^2 F/R^2 = 4s^2 R^{3s-2}\phi''(r)$ so that $R_t^{2s} = a_{\rm eff}$, where $a_{\rm eff}$ is the s-wave scattering "length" of a particle of mass M on the potential $v(r) = V(r^{1/(2s)})r^{-2+1/s}/(4s^2)$. We suppose here that $a_{\rm eff} > 0$, e.g. because $V(R)$ is non-negative.

[6] For $s = 0$ this becomes $F(R) \underset{R\to 0}{=} \ln(R/R_t) + O(R^2 \ln R)$.

[7] On a narrow resonance of Feshbach length R_* one gets from [21] $(\frac{m_r R_*^2}{2\hbar^2}E_{\rm glob})^s = \frac{1-s}{1+s}\frac{\Gamma(1+2s)}{\Gamma(1-2s)} f(v_{1,0}) \prod_{n\in\mathbb{N}^*} \frac{f(v_{1,n})}{f(u_{1,n})}$ with $f(z) = \Gamma(z-s)\Gamma(1+z-s)/[\Gamma(z+s)\Gamma(1+z+s)]$.

[8] In peculiar cases, known as three-body resonances, see [18, 35], R_t/b can be arbitrarily large and $\beta E_{\rm glob}$ can remain finite in the zero-range limit. This is improbable here as there is already a two-body resonance.

tion for the energy spectrum $(\epsilon_q(\omega))_{q\in\mathbb{N}}$ [19] [9]:

$$\frac{\Gamma(\frac{1+s-E/\hbar\omega}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{1-s-E/\hbar\omega}{2})} = \left(\frac{E_{\rm glob}}{2\hbar\omega}\right)^s \tag{27}$$

we recalculate the quantum defect as in [32], using the Euler reflection and Stirling formulas:

$$\Delta(\epsilon) = 2 + \frac{2}{\pi}\,\mathrm{atan}\,\frac{\mathrm{th}[\frac{s}{2}\ln(\epsilon/E_{\rm glob})]}{\tan(\frac{s}{2}\pi)} \tag{28}$$

When $R_t \to 0$, $\beta E_{\rm glob} \to +\infty$ and this reproduces the value $1+s$ of the quantum defect in Eq.(5). Eq.(28) only revises the contribution of the channel $(1,0)$, since the other channels have $u_{l,n} > 1$ for the values of α in Fig. 1:

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)} \underset{0<s<1}{=} -\frac{3}{2}\int_0^{+\infty} \mathrm{d}\epsilon\beta[\Delta(\epsilon) - (1+v_{1,0})]e^{-\beta\epsilon} \tag{29}$$

In Fig. 1 we plot for $\alpha < \alpha_c$ the corresponding values of $\bar{B}_{2,1}$, for the same values of the parameter $\beta E_{\rm glob}$ as in the part $\alpha > \alpha_c$ of the figure, leading to an apparently smooth connection at $\alpha = \alpha_c$. The continuity of the connection could be expected from the fact that (i) the formal change $s \to i|s|$ in Eq.(28) reproduces the value (19) of the quantum defect on the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$ apart from the nearest-integer function which is irrelevant when $|s| \to 0$, and (ii) the Efimovian trimer spectrum has a vanishing contribution to $\bar{B}_{2,1}$ when $\alpha \to \alpha_c^+$.

Indeed $\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}(\alpha)$ (and $\bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha)$) are smooth functions of α at α_c at fixed $\beta E_{\rm glob}$, since $\Delta(\epsilon)$ is an even function of s and its series expansion only has even powers of s:

$$\Delta(\epsilon) \underset{s\to 0}{=} \Delta_0(\epsilon) - \frac{x}{6}s^2 + \frac{x^3-\pi^2 x}{360}s^4 + O(s^6) \tag{30}$$

where $\Delta_0(\epsilon)$ is given by Eq.(20), $x = \ln(\epsilon/E_{\rm glob})$, and s can be real or purely imaginary. Insertion in Eq.(29) leads to converging integrals over ϵ and to an expansion of $\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}$ with only even powers of s:

$$\bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}(\alpha) - \bar{B}_{2,1}^{(1,0)}(\alpha_c) \underset{s\to 0}{=} -\frac{A}{4}s^2 - \frac{A(\pi^2-2A^2)-4\zeta(3)}{480}s^4 + O(s^6) \tag{31}$$

where $A = \ln(e^\gamma \beta E_{\rm glob})$ and $\gamma \simeq 0.577$ is Euler's constant [10]. Since s^2 is a smooth function of α across α_c, so is $\bar{B}_{2,1}$.



Fig. 2: Scaling-law analysis of Fig.1 for α close to α_c in the limit $\beta E_{\rm glob} \to +\infty$. (a) For a fixed $t \equiv s\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$: the data approach the law (33) (black solid line), provided that $|t| < 2\pi$ on the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$. Curves from top to bottom: $\beta E_{\rm glob} = 10^2$(cyan), 10^4(violet). Dashed line: 0-parameter theory prediction $-3t/2$. (b) On the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$, for a fixed $u \equiv [|t|/(2\pi) - 1]\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$: the data approach the law (34) (black solid line), which reproduces the peaked structure seen in Fig.1. From bottom to top for $u < -0.6$: values of $\beta E_{\rm glob}$ listed in the caption of Fig.1, with the same order and colors. Inset: from Eqs.(9,18,19), Eq.(34) taken with $u = \ln(\beta|E_0|)$ also gives the limit of $e^{\beta E_0}\bar{B}_{2,1}$ for $\alpha \to \alpha_c^+$ at fixed $k_BT/|E_0|$.

Eq.(31), combined with $\Lambda_1(s) = 0$, predicts how the first order derivative at α_c diverges when $\beta E_{\rm glob} \to +\infty$:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\alpha}\bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha_c) \underset{\beta E_{\rm glob}\to+\infty}{\sim} C\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob}) \text{ with } C \simeq 0.0478243 \tag{32}$$

It also suggests an interesting scaling law close to α_c: keeping in the coefficients of the powers of s in (31) only the leading terms in $\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$, one uncovers, after multiplication of (31) by $\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$, the following law when $\beta E_{\rm glob}$ tends to infinity at fixed $t \equiv s\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$:

$$[\bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha) - \bar{B}_{2,1}(\alpha_c)]\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob}) \underset{\beta E_{\rm glob}\to+\infty}{\overset{t \text{ fixed}}{\to}} 3 - \frac{3t/2}{\mathrm{th}(t/2)} \tag{33}$$

with no constraint on the side $\alpha < \alpha_c$, and with the constraint that $|t| < 2\pi$ on the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$ due to the occurrence of a pole at $t = 2\pi i$ in the quantum defect contribution and to a divergence of the ground trimer contribution for $|t| > 2\pi$. Eq.(33) is obtained by neglecting $\ln(\beta\epsilon)$ as compared to $\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$ in (19,28), as $\beta\epsilon$ is typically unity in the integrals (18,29). In Fig. 2a we replot the data of Fig.1 after rescaling as in Eq.(33): the results are indeed almost aligned on a single scaling curve given by Eq.(33), the better the larger $\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$ is. The 0-parameter zero-range theory prediction $-3t/2$, see dashed line, is only asymptotically equivalent to the correct law at $t \to +\infty$.

[9] The ground state solution of this equation must be omitted, because it connects when $\omega \to 0$ to a bound state of energy $-E_{\rm glob}$ and spatial extension $\approx R_t$, which cannot be faithfully described by our zero-range model when $R_t \approx b$ (i.e. in the absence of three-body resonance) and indeed does not exist in the three-body hard-core or in the narrow Feshbach resonance model [21]. This is equivalent to the assumption in [16] of the absence of non-universal trimer states.

[10] Exchange of Taylor expansion and integration is justified by the theorem of derivation under the integral, where x is the integration variable. For $\alpha < \alpha_c$, one sets $u(x,s) = \mathrm{th}(sx/2)/s$ and $v(x,s) = \tan(s\pi/2)/s$ and one fixes some $\eta \in]0,1[$. Then there exist positive numbers $(A_n, B_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $C > 0$ such that $\forall (x,s) \in \mathbb{R}\times[0,\eta]$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$: $|\partial_s^n u(x,s)| \le A_n|x|^{n+1}$, $|\partial_s^n v(x,s)| \le B_n$, $u(x,s)^2 + v(x,s)^2 \ge C$. For $\alpha > \alpha_c$ one sets $u(x,|s|) = [\pi\sin(|s|x) - x\sinh(\pi|s|)]/|s|^2$ and $v(x,|s|) = [\cosh(\pi|s|) - \cos(|s|x)]/|s|^2$ and one fixes some $\eta > 0$. Then there exist positive numbers $(A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $G > 0$ such that $\forall (x,|s|) \in \mathbb{R}\times[0,\eta]$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$: $|\partial_{|s|}^n u(x,|s|)| \le A_n|x| + B_n|x|^{n+2}$, $|\partial_{|s|}^n v(x,|s|)| \le C_n + D_n|x|^{2+n}$, $|v(x,|s|)| \ge G$. The u and v functions appear in $\partial_s\Delta(\epsilon)$ as $(v\partial_s u - u\partial_s v)/(u^2+v^2)$ for $\alpha < \alpha_c$, and in $\partial_{|s|}\Delta(\epsilon)$ as u/v for $\alpha > \alpha_c$. Then $|\partial_s^n\Delta|$ and $|\partial_{|s|}^n\Delta|$ are polynomially bounded in $|x|$ uniformly in s or $|s|$ $\forall n \in \mathbf{N}^*$.

The scaling law fully justifies the intuitive condition (26): the crossover from the 0- to the 1-parameter zero-range regime indeed occurs for $s \approx 1/\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$.

What happens on the side $\alpha > \alpha_c$ close to $|t| = 2\pi$? For $|t|$ fixed to a value $> 2\pi$, the ground-trimer contribution $3e^{-\beta E_0}$, where $E_0 = \epsilon_0(0^+)$, rapidly diverges when $\beta E_{\rm glob} \to +\infty$ and dominates all other contributions, so that the reduced cluster coefficient $e^{\beta E_0}\bar{B}_{2,1}$ of Fig. 1 tends to three. However, before that, the reduced cluster coefficient exhibits as a function of α an interesting structure in Fig. 1, a sharp rise with a maximum, that corresponds to a neighbourhood of $|t| = 2\pi$ with a width $1/\ln(\beta E_{\rm glob})$. This is revealed by the affine change of variable $u \equiv [|t|/(2\pi) - 1](\ln \beta E_{\rm glob})$. When $\beta E_{\rm glob} \to +\infty$ for fixed u, $\beta E_0 \to -e^u$, the ground-trimer contribution remains finite and, from dominated convergence theorem,

$$e^{\beta E_0}\bar{B}_{2,1} \underset{\beta E_{\rm glob}\to+\infty}{\overset{u \text{ fixed}}{\to}} e^{-e^u}\left[B_{2,1}(\alpha_c) + 3\left(e^{e^u} - \frac{1}{2}\right) + \frac{3}{\pi}\int_0^{+\infty} {\rm d}\epsilon \beta e^{-\beta\epsilon}\,{\rm atan}\,\frac{u - \ln\beta\epsilon}{\pi}\right] \quad (34)$$

where $B_{2,1}(\alpha_c) \simeq 1.7153$ [16] is the prediction of the 0-parameter zero-range theory at α_c. As shown in Fig. 2b, the rescaled data of Fig. 1 nicely converge to this law.

Conclusion. – As compared to the usual zero-range theory we have found corrections of order $1/\ln(\lambda_t/R_t)$ to the third virial coefficient of a two-component unitary Fermi gas, close to and below the threshold for the Efimov effect, at a distance $\alpha_c - \alpha$ scaling as $1/[\ln(\lambda_t/R_t)]^2$, where R_t is a three-body parameter and λ_t a thermal de Broglie wavelength; these $1/\ln(\lambda_t/R_t)$ corrections arise from short-range three-body correlations, that is from triplets of close atoms[11]. As a consequence, for a given finite λ_t/R_t as in all realistic systems, the third virial coefficient reconnects smoothly to its values deduced from the Efimov zero-range model above the threshold, precluding the unphysical first-order phase transition predicted by zero-range theory. Our predictions may be tested by measuring the equation of state of mixtures of fermionic cold atoms with a mass ratio $\alpha \simeq 13.6$, such as ^{3}He* and ^{40}K.

Acknowledgments. – S.E. thanks JSPS for support.

REFERENCES

[1] K. Huang, *Statistical Mechanics* (Wiley, New York, 1963).
[2] E. Beth, G.E. Uhlenbeck, Physica III **8**, 729 (1936); Physica IV **10**, 915 (1937).
[3] P.C. Hemmer, Phys. Lett. **27A**, 377 (1968); B. Jancovici, Phys. Rev. **178**, 295 (1969); Phys. Rev. **184**, 119 (1969); B. Jancovici, S. Merkuriev, Phys. Rev. A **12**, 2610 (1975).
[4] T.D. Lee, C.N. Yang, Phys. Rev. **116**, 25 (1959); A. Pais, G.E. Uhlenbeck, Phys. Rev. **116**, 250 (1959); S.K. Adhikari, R.D. Amado, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27**, 485 (1971); W.G. Gibson, Phys. Rev. A **6**, 2469 (1972).
[5] K.M. O'Hara *et al.*, Science **298**, 2179 (2002); T. Bourdel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 020402 (2003); C.A. Regal, M. Greiner, D.S. Jin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 040403 (2004); M. Zwierlein *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 120403 (2004).
[6] A. Comtet, Y. Georgelin, S. Ouvry, J. Phys. A **22**, 3917 (1989); J. McCabe, S. Ouvry, Phys. Lett. B **260**, 113 (1990).
[7] Xia-Ji Liu, Hui Hu, P. D. Drummond, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 160401 (2009); Phys. Rev. A **82**, 023619 (2010).
[8] D.K. Kaplan, Sichun Sun, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 030601 (2011); X. Leyronas, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 053633 (2011).
[9] M. Horikoshi, S. Nakajima, M. Ueda, T. Mukaiyama, Science **327**, 442 (2010); N. Navon, S. Nascimbène, F. Chevy, C. Salomon, Science **328**, 729 (2010); Mark Ku, A. Sommer, L. Cheuk, M. Zwierlein, Science **335**, 563 (2012).
[10] S. Nascimbène *et al.*, Nature **463**, 1057 (2010).
[11] V. Efimov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **12**, 589 (1971); V. Efimov, Nucl. Phys. A **210**, 157 (1973); A. Bulgac, V. Efimov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **22**, 296 (1975).
[12] Y. Castin, F. Werner, Rev. can. phys. **91**, 382 (2013).
[13] J. von Stecher, J. Phys. B **43**, 101002 (2010).
[14] S. Piatecki, W. Krauth, Nature Comm. **5**, 3503 (2014).
[15] D.S. Petrov, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 010703 (2003); E. Braaten, H.-W. Hammer, Phys. Rep. **428**, 259 (2006).
[16] K.M. Daily, D. Blume, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 013609 (2012).
[17] F. Werner, Y. Castin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 150401 (2006).
[18] F. Werner, Y. Castin, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 053604 (2006); Y. Castin, F. Werner, chap. 5, *The BCS-BEC Crossover and the Unitary Fermi Gas*, LNIP 836, W. Zwerger ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2011).
[19] F. Werner, PhD thesis, Univ. Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris, 2008), `tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00285587`.
[20] R. Minlos, L. Faddeev, Sov. Phys. JETP **14**, 1315 (1962).
[21] Y. Castin, E. Tignone, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 062704 (2011).
[22] G. Gasaneo, J.H. Macek, J. Phys. B **35**, 2239 (2002); M. Birse, J. Phys. A **39**, L49 (2006).
[23] Y. Castin, Comptes Rendus Physique **5**, 407 (2004).
[24] L.P. Pitaevskii, A. Rosch, Phys. Rev. A **55**, R853 (1997).
[25] O. Kartavtsev, A. Malykh, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Phys. **86**, 713 (2007).
[26] L. Landau, E. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics* (Elsevier Science, Oxford, 2003).
[27] P. Morse, H. Feshbach, *Methods of Theoretical Physics*, vol. II, p. 1665 (Mc Graw-Hill, New York, 1953).
[28] L. Pricoupenko, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 043633 (2010).
[29] M. Jona-Lasinio, L. Pricoupenko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 023201 (2010).
[30] S. Endo, P. Naidon, M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 062703 (2012).
[31] S. Jonsell, H. Heiselberg, C.J. Pethick, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 250401 (2002).
[32] F. Werner, Y. Castin, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 053633 (2012).
[33] A. Pais, G.E. Uhlenbeck, Phys. Rev. **116**, 250 (1959).
[34] A. Safavi-Naini, Seth T. Rittenhouse, D. Blume, H.R. Sadeghpour, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 032713 (2013).
[35] Y. Nishida, Dam Thanh Son, Shina Tan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090405 (2008).
[36] F. Werner, Y. Castin, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 013626 (2012).

[11] For $s < 1/2$ they dominate over more usual (here neglected) energy corrections, due to the effect of a finite range b of the two-body interaction at the level of short-range two-body correlations (only involving *pairs* of close atoms), that vanish linearly in b [36]. From Eq.(29) for $R_t/\lambda_t \to 0$, $\bar{B}_{2,1} - B_{2,1} \sim -\frac{3}{\pi}\Gamma(s+1)\sin(s\pi)/(\beta E_{\rm glob})^s$ then indeed vanishes more slowly than b, assuming that $R_t \approx b$.